Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/568,012	NEUGEBAUER ET AL.		
English and			
Examiner	Art Unit		

	JAMES CORNO	1793	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED 25 June 2009 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APP	LICATION IN CONDITION FOR A	LLOWANCE.	
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following rapplication in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appe for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:	the same day as filing a Notice of A replies: (1) an amendment, affidavited al (with appeal fee) in compliance	Appeal. To avoid abar t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Adno event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (left)	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE	date of the final rejection	n.
MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extruder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.1 ension and the corresponding amount of hortened statutory period for reply origi	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Offic	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as
 The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compl filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed wi AMENDMENTS 	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, b (a) They raise new issues that would require further cor (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below (c) They are not deemed to place the application in bett appeal; and/or	nsideration and/or search (see NOT »);	E below);	
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a converge NOTE: See Continuation Sheet. (See 37 CFR 1.12) 4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): 6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowed.	16 and 41.33(a)). 21. See attached Notice of Non-Cor	mpliant Amendment (I	,
non-allowable claim(s). 7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is proved the status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: 1-37. Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE	will not be entered, or b) will	•	
8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).			
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to or showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	ıl and/or appellant fail:	s to provide a
10. \square The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation	n of the status of the claims after er	ntry is below or attach	ed.
REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER 11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but the arguments presented were all considered and deemed			
12. ☐ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i>(s). (13. ☐ Other:	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)		
/Jessica L. Ward/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1793			

Continuation of 3. NOTE: The amendment to claim 1 incorporating the limitations of claims 5 and 9 combines claim limitations that were not previously examined in combination. For example, claim 3 was previously rejected by Minemoto which was not used to reject claims 5 and 9. Claim 3, which depends from claim 1, now requires the limitations of claims 5 and 9. Claims 5 and 9 were rejected by Roman but this referene was not used to reject claim 3. A similar scenario applies to other dependent claims and the rejections set forth using the primary references to Park et al. (US Patent No. 5,654,258), Peterson et al. (US Patent No. 6,004,584), and Technical Bulletin Pigments No. 31 (Degussa AG, November 1995).